REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the December 27, 2007 final Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. Claims 1-3, 8, 10-14, and 16-26 have been amended and claim 4 has been canceled by this Amendment D. Thus, claims 1-3 and 5-34 are presented in the application for further examination.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0042821 to Muret et al. (Muret). Applicants disagree, but have amended the claims for clarity.

Muret discloses a system for storing log data from log files 510 by a log engine 200 to a database 300. A report engine 400 is separately available, and accesses the stored data in the database 300 to produce reports to the user 530. Applicants direct the Examiner to FIG. 1 of Muret, and respectfully emphasize the logical flow clearly disclosed in FIG. 1 by viewing the arrowheads in the figure:

1. Log files 510 are received by the log engine 200;

2. Then the log engine 200 stores the log files in the database 300;

3. At some subsequent time (e.g., after receiving a request from the user), the report engine 400 accesses the database 300 to obtain data, generate a report with the data, and send the report to the user 530.

The logical flow in FIG. 1 of Muret clearly shows the log files 510, the log engine 200, the database 300, and then the report engine 400. The text in Muret corresponding to FIG. 1 also supports this logical flow. This order of logical flow is important when considering the differences between the cited art and the present invention because it clearly shows that Muret involves a completely different problem than Applicants invention. As described in greater detail below, Muret is not concerned at all with optimizing the storage of log files while preserving the format of the received web log data. In other words, the cited art does not permit handling web log data free from reconfiguring the data's format. Because of the voluminous nature of web log data, requiring such format changes largely renders the data unmanageable.

Moreover, Muret fails to address opening a new file based on the log cut interval and without modifying the data's format.

Claim 16, 21, and 26

Referring first to claim 16, this claim as amended recites:

a configuration component to access **configuration information associated with the web log data to be stored**, said configuration information including at least one expression;
an interface component to receive web log data to be stored from a web server, said web log data including at least one condition, said condition being associated with the web log data and affecting storage thereof, **said received web log data being in a format defined by a web server**;
an expression component to evaluate the expression accessed by the configuration component based on the condition received by the interface component, wherein the expression specifies one or more operations for organizing the received web log; and
a storage component to **store at least a portion of the received web log data received** by the interface component **in accordance with the expression** evaluated by the expression component **without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server.**

As an example, the logging software may be configured to only log clickstream data from users who click on banner A then banner B or to only track server X during interval Y. (Page 5, paragraph 22). In particular, the logging software accesses configuration information associated with the data to be stored. (Page 5, paragraph 22). The configuration information includes at least one expression which includes a combination of symbols (e.g., identifiers, values, and operators) that yields a result (e.g., a value representing a condition) upon evaluation. (Page 5, paragraph 22). The web server establishes the configuration information at some time prior to operation of the logging software. (Page 5, paragraph 22). The logging software receives data (e.g., from a computing device), including at least one condition representing the state of an expression or variable. (Page 5, paragraph 22). The logging software evaluates the expression based on the condition at and formats the data in accordance with the accessed configuration information prior to storing the data per the evaluated expression. (Page 5, paragraph 22). For example, the evaluated expression may indicate that only a portion of the received data should be stored. (Page 5, paragraph 22). The invention is configurable such that logging specifications may be fulfilled by simply modifying configuration information. (Page 2, paragraph 6). For

example, in a software implementation, no modifications would need to be made to the core software implementing the invention (e.g., the web server) to adjust the logging specifications. (Page 2, paragraph 6).

As explained above, Muret fails to teach or disclose storing " **at least a portion of the received web log data received ... in accordance with the expression evaluated by the expression component without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server"** as recited in claim 16. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 21 and 26 have been similarly amended and are allowable for at least the reasons as claim 16. The claims depending from independent claims 16, 21, and 26 further limit the claims from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are patentable for least the same reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are patentable.

Claim 1

Claim 1 as amended recites:

> accessing configuration information associated with web log data to be stored, said **configuration information including** at least one expression and **defining a log cut interval**;
> **creating and opening a web log file**;
> receiving the web log data to be stored from a web server, said web log data including at least one condition associated therewith, said condition affecting storage of the received web log data, said received web log data being in a format defined by the web server;
> evaluating the expression from the accessed configuration information, said evaluation occurring based on the condition associated with the received web log data, wherein the expression specifies one or more operations for organizing the received web log data; and
> **storing at least a portion of the received web log data in the opened web log fil**e in accordance with the expression evaluated based on the condition associated with the received web log data **without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server, wherein the opened web log file is closed and a new web log file is created and opened based on the log cut interval.**

The web server sends, for example, the notification to the logging software just after authenticating the user associated with the data and before preparing the response headers. (Pages 6-7, paragraph 26). During startup, the logging software performs configuration

initialization, authentication, and file creation. (Pages 6-7, paragraph 26). The logging software also initializes management of log cut data. (Pages 6-7, paragraph 26). Log cut data identifies the circumstances (e.g., time intervals) in which a new file is to be opened. At the specified intervals, the logging software opens a new file to store data. (Pages 6-7, paragraph 26). After startup, the logging software is ready to receive data. (Pages 6-7, paragraph 26).

Muret fails to disclose any implementation for handling web log data free from reconfiguring the data's format. Moreover, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest **"storing at least a portion of the received web log data in the opened web log file ... wherein the opened web log file is closed and a new web log file is created and opened based on the log cut interval"** as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn. The claims depending from independent claim 1 further limit the claims from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the dependent claims are patentable for least the same reasons that the independent claim from which they depend is patentable.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-3 and 5-34 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. Bain/

Robert M. Bain, Reg. No. 36,736
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400